

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Corise Kennedy,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	Civil Action No. 7:23-cv-18-BHH
v.	)	
	)	
Carolina Foothills Federal Credit Union,	)	
Scott Weaver,	)	<b><u>ORDER</u></b>
	)	
Defendants.	)	
_____	)	

This matter is before the Court upon Plaintiff Corise Kennedy's ("Plaintiff") pro se complaint. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(d), D.S.C., the matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge for preliminary determinations.

On February 21, 2023, Magistrate Judge Kevin F. McDonald issued an order notifying Plaintiff that her complaint was subject to summary dismissal and instructing Plaintiff to file an amended complaint correcting the deficiencies noted in the order. Plaintiff failed to file an amended complaint as instructed.

On March 17, 2023, therefore, the Magistrate Judge issued a report and recommendation ("Report"), outlining the issues and recommending that the Court dismiss the matter with prejudice, without further leave to amend, and without issuance and service of process. Attached to the Magistrate Judge's Report was a notice advising Plaintiff of the right to file written objections to the Report within fourteen days of being served with a copy. To date, no objections have been filed.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to the Court. The

recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The Court is charged with making a *de novo* determination only of those portions of the Report to which specific objections are made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In the absence of specific objections, the Court reviews the matter only for clear error. See *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’”) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

Here, because Plaintiff has not filed objections to the Report, the Court has reviewed the record, the applicable law, and the findings and recommendations of the Magistrate Judge for clear error. After review, the Court finds no clear error and agrees with the Magistrate Judge’s analysis. Accordingly, the Court **adopts and incorporates** the Magistrate Judge’s Report (ECF No. 19), and the Court **dismisses this action with prejudice, without further leave to amend, and without issuance and service of process.**

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

/s/Bruce H. Hendricks  
United States District Judge

April 11, 2023  
Charleston, South Carolina